

corded de Klerk have romanticized a conflictual relationship and personalized it into a literal black-versus-white conflict. Yet Mandela and de Klerk need to be demystified in order to achieve a sober assessment of the interests behind them and a detailed knowledge of their interacting constituencies. We aim at the hidden reality beyond the pious resolutions and public posturing. We wish to lay bare some of the social conditions and constraints under which these leaders act and thereby contribute to a more nuanced understanding of Southern Africa.

We originally intended to cover the entire region in depth. However, the overwhelming dominance of South Africa together with the unresolved political developments in many frontline states have led us to sketch only general trends in other parts of the subcontinent and to focus more fully on the politics of the post-apartheid state. Regardless of who is in power, South Africa resembles the US in economically dominating its neighbours. With the political objections removed, a common market in an economically interdependent region would be an obvious and advantageous choice for Southern Africa. Only if the industrialized South acts as an engine of growth in the rest of the region and accords favourable terms of trade, investment and development assistance to its war-ravaged neighbours, can a speedy turnaround be realistically expected.

At the end of the 20th century it should no longer be necessary to argue the case against racial privilege in whatever guise. The tragic record of suffering and destruction by that grotesque Verwoerdian experiment of social engineering is too self-evident to deserve refutation or even condemnation. It seems time to substitute sober analysis and strategic pragmatism for moral outrage. Yet a striking feature of Canadian writing and NGO pronouncements on South Africa is moral self-righteousness. Most Canadian academics in the field outbid each other in little more than strong partisanship. An influential Toronto journal (*Southern Africa Report*) regularly heaps abuse on Ottawa and asks after years of responsive anti-apartheid efforts: "Can we any longer afford to be polite towards the Canadian government and its minions regarding this country's South Africa policy?" (SAR, January 1992).